

REMARKS

The above Amendments and these Remarks are in reply to the Office Action mailed August 11, 2006.

I. Summary of Examiner's Objections and Rejections

Prior to the Office Action mailed August 11, 2006, Claims 1-28 were pending in the Application. In the Office Action, the Specification was objected to as failing to provide proper antecedent basis for the claimed subject matter. Claims 11, 14, 18, 21, 25, and 28 were objected to due to informalities. Claims 1-28 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter. Claims 22-28 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter. Claims 1-28 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Ali et al (U.S. Patent No. 6,920,607, hereafter Ali).

II. Summary of Applicant's Amendments

The present Reply amends Claims 1-2, 8-9, 11, and 14-28, leaving for the Examiner's present consideration Claims 1-28. Reconsideration of the application as amended is respectfully requested. Applicant respectfully reserves the right to prosecute any originally presented claims in a continuing or future application.

III. The Specification

In the Office Action mailed August 11, 2006, the Specification was objected to as failing to provide proper antecedent basis for the claimed subject matter. Claims 15-21 have been amended as shown above. Applicant respectfully submits that the Specification now provide proper antecedent basis for the claimed subject matter, and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested.

The Specification has also been amended. The amendments to the Specification are made to provide filing application information to Cross-Referenced Applications which were not known at the time of filing of this application. No new substantive or significant matter have been added to this Application.

IV. Claim Objections

In the Office Action mailed August 11, 2006, Claims 11, 14, 18, 21, 25, and 28 were objected to due to misnumbered sequence of limitations. Claims 11, 14, 18, 21, 25, and 28 have been amended as shown above, and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested.

V. Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 101

In the Office Action mailed August 11, 2006, Claims 1-28 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as being directed to non-statutory matter. Claims 22-28 were also rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter. Claims 1, 8, 15, and 22-28 have been amended as shown above. Applicant respectfully submits that the claims, as amended, conform to the requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 101 and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested.

VI. Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102

In the Office Action mailed August 11, 2006, Claims 1-28 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(c) as being anticipated by Ali.

Claim 1

Claim 1 has been amended by the current Response to more clearly define the embodiment therein. As amended, Claim 1 defines:

1. (Currently Amended) A computer-based extendable application framework, comprising:
a user interface;
at least one service;
at least one extension;
wherein one of the at least one extension can provide functionality accessible in the user interface; and
wherein one of the at least one service can provide access to functionality in one of the at least one extension to another one of the at least one extension.

Claim 1 has been amended to state that one of the at least one service can provide access to functionality in one of the at least one extension to another one of the at least one extension. Thus, not only is the functionality provided by extensions accessible in the user interface, services can also provide access to functionality in an extension to other extensions

Ali discloses methods and systems for dynamically creating user interfaces. As disclosed therein, by using independent data files, a user interface can be dynamically modified by changing the description of the user interface in the data files themselves (col. 6, lines 61-64). In one embodiment of Ali, an application invokes a XML data file and a browser. The browser, in response to the execution of the application, loads a base DHTML document, XML data that contains a namespace navigation link to a file, and the data file. The browser verifies the XML data format against a XML schema and processes the XML data with a XML template to render a DHTML document that forms the UI on the display (figure 5). By editing the text in the XML data, a designer can dynamically modify a UI simply by changing the description of the UI in the XML data file.

Claim 1 has been amended such that in the embodiment defined by Claim 1, one of the at least one service can provide access to functionality in one of the at least one extension *to another one of the at least one extension*. It is respectfully submitted that this feature is not disclosed in Ali. The application in Ali simply invokes an XML data file, and there is no indication of the application being able to provide to other XML data files access to the functionality in the invoked XML data file.

In view of the comments provided above, Applicant respectfully submits that the embodiment defined by Claim 1 is neither anticipated by, nor obvious in view of the cited reference, and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested.

Claims 8, 15, and 22

Claims 8, 15, and 22 have been similarly amended to more clearly define the embodiments therein. For reasons as provided above with respect to Claim 1, Applicant respectfully submits that Claims 8, 15, and 22, as amended, is likewise neither anticipated by, nor obvious in view of the cited references, and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested.

Claims 2-7, 9-14, 16-21, and 23-28

Dependent Claims 2-7, 9-14, 16-21, and 23-28 are allowable as depending from an allowable independent claim and further in view of the additional limitations of these claims. Applicant respectfully submits that Claims 2-7, 9-14, 16-21, and 23-28 are similarly neither anticipated by, nor obvious in view of the cited references, and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested. It is also respectfully submitted that these claims also add their own limitations which render them patentable in their own right. Applicant respectfully reserves the right to argue these limitations should it become necessary in the future.

VII. Conclusion

In light of the above, it is respectfully submitted that all of the claims now pending in the subject patent application should be allowable, and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested. The Examiner is respectfully requested to telephone the undersigned if he can assist in any way in expediting issuance of a patent.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any underpayment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 06-1325 for any matter in connection with this response, including any fee for extension of time, which may be required.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 11/13/06

By: /Guanyao Cheng/
Guanyao Cheng
Reg. No. 58,555

Customer No. 23910
FLIESLER MEYER LLP
Four Embarcadero Center, Fourth Floor
San Francisco, California 94111-4156
Telephone: (415) 362-3800